

MINUTES
MICHIGAN STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING
January 27, 2005
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present: Ted Wahby, Chairman
Betty Jean Awrey, Vice Chairwoman
John Garside, Commissioner
Linda Miller Atkinson, Commissioner
Vincent J. Brennan, Commissioner

Also Present: Gloria J. Jeff, Director
Kirk Steudle, Chief Deputy Director
Larry Tibbits, Chief Operations Officer
Frank E. Kelley, Commission Advisor
Marneta Griffin, Executive Assistant
Jerry Jones, Commission Auditor
Patrick Isom, Assistant Attorney General
John Polasek, Bureau Director, Highway Development
Susan Mortel, Bureau Director, Transportation Planning
John Friend, Bureau Director, Highway Delivery
Myron Frierson, Bureau Director, Finance and Administration
Ron DeCook, Director, Office of Governmental Affairs
Rob Abent, Bureau Director, Multi-Modal Transportation
Denise Jackson, Administrator, Statewide Planning
Carmine Palombo, Chairman, Transportation Asset Management Council

Excused: Robert Bender, Commissioner

A list of those people who attended the meeting is attached to the official minutes on file in the Commission office.

Chairman Wahby called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. in the Bureau of Aeronautics Auditorium in Lansing, Michigan.

I. COMMISSION BUSINESS

Commission Minutes

Chairman entertained a motion for approval of the minutes of the State Transportation Commission meeting of December 9, 2004.

Moved by Commissioner Awrey, with support from Commissioner Garside, to approve the minutes of the Commission meeting of December 9, 2004. MOTION CARRIED.

II. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT – DIRECTOR GLORIA J. JEFF**

2005-2009 Five Year Transportation Program (5YTP)

Director Jeff gave a re-cap of the 5YTP which was brought before the Commission in Draft form on December 9, 2004. The 5YTP will follow a Multi-Modal format, will include a one year element (2005) for Aviation, Transit, Rail, Marine/Port Programs and Major Projects, a five year element (2005-2009) for Highway Program and Project List, as well as Revenue Projections and Investment Strategies. This program includes about \$1.7 billion annually (highways, \$1.3 billion; aviation, \$217 million; bus, rail, marine, \$265 million).

The timeline involved the program development during summer/fall 2004, a system condition workshop with the Commission on October 28, 2004, presenting a draft of the program to the Commission on December 9, 2004 (at which time we received endorsement to hold listening sessions), conducting listening sessions from January 5-21, 2005, and asking for final approval from the Commission on today. This timeline was met in order to provide the Legislature with the 5YTP on January 28, 2005. (Budgetary Reporting Requirements, Section 307 states: Before February 1 of each year, the department will provide to the legislature, the state budget office, and the house and senate fiscal agencies its rolling 5-year plan listing by county or by county road commission all highway construction projects for the fiscal year and all expected projects for the ensuing fiscal years.)

Listening Session Results – Over 250 people attended the Public Listening Sessions across the state (23% were members of the General Public; 49% of the attendees were representatives from local government including Mayors, Township Supervisors, Council Members, and County Commissioners; 21% represented Businesses and Community Organizations, i.e., Chambers of Commerce, Business Owners, and Contractors; and 7% were members of State Government, predominately State Legislature members and staff). Sessions were held in the morning, afternoon, and evening over a period of two weeks in the Bay Region (Saginaw, Mt. Pleasant), Grand Region (Walker), Metro Region (Sterling Heights, Taylor, Port Huron, Waterford, Detroit), North Region (Traverse City, Alpena), Southwest Region (Kalamazoo, Benton Harbor), Superior Region (Marquette, Escanaba), and University Region (Jackson, Howell).

Additionally, Listening Sessions focused on comments regarding our accomplishments of recent years, including positive public response regarding the early completion of the M-6 freeway in Kent County and the I-96/Beck Rd Interchange construction. Passing Relief Lane Projects were identified as successful projects in the Superior Region. Preservation Goal was the subject of a considerable number of comments--1/3 of total comments were directly related to the Preserve First Program. The Grand Region favored the program stating it corresponds to local goals. Oakland and Howell comments at the TSC meetings questioned the Preserve First Program because it didn't accommodate Improve and Expand Goals in areas of rapid development. Freeway upgrade needs are generally expressed from the Southern half of the state, specifically I-94 in the Metro Region. Interchange improvement comments were made in the Metro and University Regions. Various comments asked for interchange replacement in Wixom and also for

reconsideration of a proposed interchange in Troy. Funding increases for public transit were commented on by both urban and rural regions.

Economic Benefit – For the first time in the history of the 5YTP, the department has conducted an economic analysis on the road and bridge program to assess how the projects we implement over the next 5 years will impact our state's economy. The work was done by The University of Michigan's Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations as well as a nationally recognized group out of Massachusetts called the Economic Development Research Group. They have done similar studies with the U.S., as well as Japan, Scotland, Finland, England, the Netherlands and Canada.

The methodology utilized a Regional Economic Model (REMI) to assess the economic impacts of the road and bridge program, and assessed the implications on Michigan's macro economy, including specific benefits to Michigan's core economic sectors. Two key inputs were used to assess the economic benefits: 1) type of work, location of work, and who is doing the work; 2) daily travel-time savings resulting from decreased congestion and improved pavement conditions. Travel-time savings were captured by: assessing decreases in congestion, and assessing increased vehicle speeds. This second input was based on the assumption that as pavement conditions and ride-quality worsen, free-flow speeds generally decline. When pavement conditions reach "poor" condition, vehicle speeds decline by 5 mph on freeways and 2½ mph on free-access trunklines.

Results are shown in comparison with a base case (i.e., allowing the state's road and bridge infrastructure to wear down as a consequence of not funding MDOT's activities). Results include estimates of spin-off effects in addition to the program's direct effects. Spin-off effects come from two sources: purchases from local suppliers (indirect effects), and spending by people who receive income attributable to activities related to transportation policy (i.e., a person working in a sign-manufacturing factory buying a new car). Direct effects plus spin-off effects equals total effect MDOT's investment has on the economy.

What Did the Study Tell Us? - Michigan households and businesses recognize significant travel time savings associated with improved pavement conditions and increased capacity. Michigan households will realize a savings worth \$21.7 million per year in 2005 and grows to \$57.6 million by 2009. Michigan businesses will realize a savings worth \$12 million in 2005 and grows to \$35 million by 2009. MDOT's Road and Bridge investments generate \$6.5 billion in Gross State Product over the life of the 5-year plan. Over the life of the plan, MDOT's Road and Bridge investments accumulates to provide the state \$4.2 billion in personal income. Gross State Product and Real Personal Income are two economic indicators which measure the status of our economy. Over the life of the plan, MDOT's Road and Bridge Investments accumulate to support \$10.9 billion worth of total output. The Total Output measures all intermediate goods and services that go into making a final product (value at every stage), where the GSP only measures value added dollars to the final product.

MDOT's Highway Program will create 26,550 jobs in 2005. Jobs decrease over time as a result of decreases in overall investment levels (\$1.5 billion (2005) compared to \$1.1 billion in 2009), and inflation adjusted values. Of the jobs MDOT creates, approximately

60% are non-construction with a large portion consisting of technical jobs in the professional services and business sectors. MDOT's Road and Bridge Program will result in a reduction in Michigan's unemployment as good paying jobs are provided over the duration of the plan.

Because the findings of this study are based on the fact that almost 90% of the vehicle travel savings identified as inputs were attributable to improved pavement conditions, it demonstrates and reaffirms that MDOT's Preserve First Initiative is improving the condition of our roads and bridges as well as having a positive impact on Michigan's economy.

MDOT's multi-modal systems also play an important role in Michigan's economy. Based on our current investment levels in the Transit Capital and Local Bus Operation Program, the department estimates it will create 11,333 jobs in 2005. Past studies done by the Bureau of Aeronautics have shown that for every \$1 million spent on aviation construction projects = 43 jobs are created. Based on the findings of this study and our current investment levels in the Airport Improvement Program, the department estimates it will create 9,331 jobs in 2005.

Economic Benefits – MDOT's 2005 Transportation Program creates 47,215 jobs for the State of Michigan. We will continue to assist in reducing the state's unemployment and out-migration rates, and continue to provide the backbone for all economic activity within the State of Michigan.

Director Jeff asked for questions or comments on this portion of the presentation.

Chairman Wahby stated that there has been a tremendous amount of achievement by the administration.

Commissioner Brennan concurred with Chairman Wahby. He went on to say that he hopes this economic impact can sound the alarm for other interested parties to join in the fight in Washington regarding reauthorization.

Director Jeff responded that one of the real strengths we are excited about is that we have been using the national numbers for years, and we have needed to see what that meant in Michigan. Our planning group led the effort to work with economists in putting together a model that was Michigan specific. Director Jeff stated that this information would be shared with the Governor's office and also amplified over the next several weeks. Ultimately this will be included in the information that is brought before the Congressional delegation regarding reauthorization and why we need it now.

Chairman Wahby further stated that he has talked to U.S. Senator Stabenow about the emphasis and economic impact of reauthorization. He stressed the fact that the Michigan delegation is working for us.

Director Jeff agreed with Chairman Wahby and stated that while the Michigan delegation has been very supportive, we need to be even more aggressive in getting them to continue to push. It is not a question of whether or not we have their support, it is getting them to

get their fellow colleagues to act and act now. We are now a good 16 months past the original deadline; it has cost Michigan over \$450 million from the delay of Congress not acting.

Chairman Wahby asked if one of the conditions was the fact that President Bush was going to veto any major changes.

Director Jeff answered yes; the President was not willing to consider a dollar amount above about \$256 billion over the five year period, and that \$256 billion actually represented less than inflationary increases.

No further questions were forthcoming.

Director Jeff asked for approval of the Five Year Transportation Program.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion for the approval of the Five Year Transportation Program for 2005-2009. Motion was made by Commissioner Garside and supported by Commissioner Atkinson to approve the Program. Mr. Kelley called the roll; all answered in the affirmative; motion carried on a unanimous roll call vote.

Government Performance Project (GPP) Results

What is GPP? It is a year-long, comprehensive, independent analysis of how well each state government is managed. It is collaboration between Pew Charitable Trust and *Governing* magazine. Research is conducted by a team of academics and journalists using online survey of state managers, analysis of public documents, and interviews with legislators, elected officials, citizens, and academics. Michigan received a **B+**; part of the study is quoted in saying "...State is a leader in public management." The results show that Michigan's grade places it higher than all but 6 other states (among the top 10 states nationally). The GPP report also notes infrastructure management as a particular strength, citing statewide prioritization of road maintenance needs as an example. The entire report will be available online January 31st at www.governing.com.

There are only 4 states nationally that were ranked higher than Michigan. This means that we are among the top 5 best run infrastructure agencies in the nation. Indiana received a **B**, Minnesota a **B**, Wisconsin a **C**, Illinois a **C**, and Ohio an **A**. The Ohio Department of Transportation is only focused on roads and bridges.

Director Jeff stated that this is an outstanding tribute to each and every member of Team MDOT and our partners in delivering these quality transportation projects for the businesses and residents of the state.

Reauthorization Update

The current extension expires May 31, 2005. The new legislative session will restart the debate. We have heard timetables as optimistic as March 17th as being when we would see a bill being handled by the House, the Senate hopefully completing their work by the 31st of May, which means it would be sometime this summer (after the 1st of June) where we would see a final bill signed and ready for the President's signature. The House

leadership is still waiting for the White House to indicate what they will view as an acceptable number so that they can begin deliberations.

Chairman Wahby stated that there was one plan from the Senate and one from the House, and asked if they formed a committee to present one plan.

Director Jeff stated that they did not get that done. Therefore when Congress adjourned at the end of the last session, that compromise died. This means that they must start over; the Senate and House will introduce 2 independent bills.

Commissioner Brennan asked if a similar study had been done (like the one conducted by the state) on a national level between the Senate and House bills and their dollar differences (between the two bills).

Director Jeff responded that the difference between the bills is about \$10 billion, yet still about \$40 billion from the President's number.

Commissioner Brennan suggested taking the Presidents' number (\$40 billion), subtract it from the Senate bill, then take the economic impact of what \$40 billion less in infrastructure and investment does in terms of jobs. He asked if this issue has ever been framed in Washington.

Director Jeff answered that this issue has been framed, unfortunately not with the kind of rigor that the economic study was (for Michigan).

Director Jeff continued with the presentation.

Michigan has started off the year by preparing for the Governor and the Legislative leadership a letter they have already forwarded to the members of our Congressional delegation requesting swift action, and emphasizing the importance of it to Michigan as well as the dollars lost to Michigan. We continue to focus on our reauthorization priorities of making sure that we have adequate dollars, increased rate of return, no reduction in scope, dollars for Michigan's busy border crossings, more capital dollars for bus systems which rely on reauthorization earmarks, and flexibility for states to use dollars to address priorities as they identify them.

We continue to work with donor states on the "Get It Done" campaign which is well under way. Bills will likely be introduced with figures close to those from the end of last session. The compromising resulted in \$300 billion nationwide, give or take. For Michigan this could mean as much as \$300 million more annually, depending on the bill.

Congress has a full plate. There is the war in Iraq, reauthorization, 2005-06 budgets, proposed Social Security revisions, homeland security, and all other legislation. Will transportation reauthorization still be a priority amid these issues? Director Jeff emphasized that we are going to have to be very aggressive in making sure that it rises to the top. It is not that the other issues are unimportant, but they need to understand that they are already late and the reauthorization issue needs to come off their plate.

Director Jeff asked for questions; none were forthcoming.

III. **RESOLUTIONS**

Draft Resolution for the State Transportation Commission to Delegate Speed Limit Powers to the Director of MDOT, or her Delegatee - Director Jeff

For many years, the directors of the Michigan State Police and Transportation have set speed limits on the state trunkline system by jointly signing Traffic Control Orders. It was believed some time ago that the Commission had delegated its authority on speed limits to the department. We were unable to actually find the paperwork that showed this. On the advice of the Attorney General's representative, we have come forward with a proposal to formally, again, delegate that responsibility to the department.

Director Jeff asked for approval of this resolution.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion to approve the draft resolution for the State Transportation Commission to Delegate Speed Limit Powers to the Director of MDOT, or her Delegatee. Motion was made by Commissioner Brennan and supported by Commissioner Awrey to approve the resolution. Mr. Kelley called the roll: all answers were affirmative. Motion carried on a unanimous roll call vote.

IV. **OVERSIGHT**

Commission/State Administrative Board Contracts/Agreements (Exhibit A) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson asked if any member of the Commission had questions on the 21 contracts before them for their review and approval.

None were forthcoming.

Mr. Frierson asked for approval of Exhibit A.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Garside and supported by Commissioner Awrey to approve Exhibit A. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Bid Letting Pre-Approvals (Exhibit A-1) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson gave a brief re-cap of the December 2004 and January 2005 bid letting activities. In January the department let 47 State projects; engineer's estimates were \$100 million. In terms of overall projects since the beginning of the year, \$244 million have been let, as compared to \$204 million for this time last year. The goal for this fiscal year is \$900 million in state project letting. Not reflected in the Commissioners' packets are the results of the special January 21st letting—2 projects in Ontonagon; engineer's estimate was \$16 million and the actual bid was about \$17 million.

Mr. Frierson further stated that in an effort to increase administrative efficiency the decision was made to require 100% electronic bidding; currently the department requires bids over \$1 million be submitted electronically. Effective April 1, 2005, with the April letting, all bids will be required to be submitted electronically. As a safeguard to the contractors, those bids under \$1 million will be allowed to submit paper bids until October 2005. The department is also conducting 10 training sessions for contractors so that they can learn electronic bidding procedures.

Before the Commission for approval are bid items for the February letting; 47 state projects with engineer's estimates of \$192 million. Twenty of these have project warranties.

Mr. Frierson asked for questions; none were forthcoming.

Mr. Frierson asked the Commission for approval of the bid items for the February letting in Exhibit A-1.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brennan and supported by Commissioner Awrey to approve the February bid letting. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Letting Exceptions Agenda (Exhibit A-2) – John Polasek

Mr. Polasek reported on 3 items, with justification memos, that had low bids greater than 10% over the engineer's estimate. The first is a carry over item from the December 2004 letting for an Indefinite Services Signal Upgrade Contract. We were initially going to reject all bids but after further investigation found that there was significant reason to justify accepting the bid, as described in the memo. The 2 others are from the January 2005 letting and are bridge R&R projects that have intricate construction staging and maintaining traffic issues.

Mr. Polasek asked for questions; none were forthcoming.

Mr. Polasek asked the Commission for approval of Exhibit A-2.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Garside and supported by Commissioner Atkinson to approve Exhibit A-2. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Contract Adjustments (Exhibit B) – John Friend

Mr. Friend reported on 11 projects—2 requiring further explanation. A violation of MDOT procedures occurred on Extra #2005-15 (City of Manistique, Schoolcraft County) totaling about \$4,500. As the construction staff began drilling for the bridge footing, they encountered an actual void in the soil. Realizing they needed technical help, they contacted the central office staff at C&T, and obtained general advice from the geotechnical expert. He, in turn, thought the situation warranted additional technical help beyond his ability, making it necessary for another consultant to be called in. This additional consultant was brought on board through the contract. Mr. Friend stated that

the rationale and reasoning was very solid, therefore agreeing with what they did. The violation occurred by this not being in compliance with the standard consultant selection process. Mr. Friend asked for approval of this Extra.

Mr. Friend stated that the second violation is more serious in nature, involving Overrun Item #2005-08 (M-125 in Monroe County). For reasons that weren't very well thought out, the project staff extended the project limits post award of about 4/5 of a mile and had the contractor do the work. MDOT realized quickly when the write-up came in that a serious violation of the Environmental Clearance Process had occurred. The department immediately contacted the Michigan Federal Highway Administration office, self-disclosed what the issue was, and asked for their recommendation on solving this issue. Discussions were had with Tom Fudaly, Operations Manager for MFHWA. MFHWA agreed to continued participation in the project; it's about 82% federal funds, contingent upon strong direction for the department not to have this happen again. MDOT will provide very clear written guidance to the staff that this is not to occur again. If it does, federal participation will not be continued.

Chairman Wahby asked if we were being penalized because of this.

Mr. Friend answered no.

Continuing, Mr. Friend stated that he did not fault the contractor, fault lay with the project staff for making an ill informed decision. Subsequent to that, we have had very specific training with all the TSC managers and Region Engineers. Mr. Friend assured the Commission that an incident like this would not happen again.

Mr. Friend asked for further questions.

Commissioner Brennan asked, looking at the overall cost overruns—the most he has seen during his tenure with the Commission, what was attributing to the large amount this month.

Mr. Friend answered that typically during this time, January-March, you will see the bulk of Extras come through because the construction season has wound up, and project staff are completing the required paperwork for closing out contracts. One thing that we do track is how to compare the overall program in terms of what was bid out versus the actual cost. This number is tracked yearly. Michigan has about 3% total program increases.

Commissioner Garside asked what the national average is.

Mr. Friend answered that most other DOTs are about 8%.

No other questions were forthcoming.

Mr. Friend asked the Commission for approval of Exhibit B.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion for the approval of Exhibit B. Motion was made by Commissioner Brennan and supported by Commissioner Awrey to approve Exhibit B. The motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

V. **PRESENTATIONS**

MDOT's 100th Year Centennial Celebration Committee - Janet Foran/Jan Seeger, Co-Chairs

Director Jeff began by saying that this is a special year for MDOT. We will be 100 years old and this is especially significant in that we are among the top 5 in managing our road infrastructure nationally, as well as our grade as a State is B+.

Jan Seeger went over the Centennial highlights that will take place during 2005:

January 6 – Internal kickoff event for employees in Lansing and all statewide facilities, unveiling of the new revitalized Hall of Honor in the Transportation building;

January 12 or 13 – Public announcement at the **International Auto Show (Media Day)** at Cobo Hall in Detroit with Governor Granholm;

May 14 (Saturday) – Transportation Day at the Michigan Historical Center;

June 25 – International Bridge Walk and community celebration in Sault Ste. Marie and Ontario;

July – Birthday Celebrations in each region;

September 5 (Labor Day) – Special celebration during the **Mackinac Bridge Walk**;

November – Dedication of 100-year tribute in Lansing.

Information on special features can be found on the Centennial website at www.michigan.gov/mdot100.

All Centennial events are predicated on donations. Centennial merchandise such as t-shirts, calendars, mugs, polo shirts are being sold. Other items, events or visuals include (but not limited to): a special issue of *Michigan History* and *Michigan History for Kids* magazines, commemorative posters, a commemorative children's book, special enhancement of MLK Boulevard in Lansing, related to the Capitol Loop reconstruction project, golf outing on July 22nd in Williamston. Everything is covered either by donations or enhancement monies.

Ms. Seeger asked for questions.

Commissioner Awrey stated that it should be stressed that **no taxpayer dollars have been used** for any portion of the celebration expenses.

Janet Foran stated that the committee is sensitive to that. They have included a statement as such on news releases, and have placed a disclaimer on every publication.

Director Jeff interjected that there is a blue ribbon committee serving as the fundraising arm chaired by John Woodford, a former Director of MDOT.

No other questions were forthcoming.

Asset Management Council Report & Highlights of 2004 – Carmine Palombo, Chairman
Adopted goal statement and four major objectives - The Transportation Asset Management Council will expand the practice of asset management statewide to enhance the productivity of investing in Michigan's roads and bridges through coordination and collaboration among state and local transportation agencies by:

- 1) Surveying and reporting the condition of roads and bridges by functional classification categories for the State and Regional Planning areas,
- 2) Assessing completed and planned investments in roads and bridges by the various transportation agencies of the state,
- 3) Supporting the development of appropriate asset management tools and procedures, and
- 4) Providing education and training on the benefits of developing road improvement programs through the use of asset management principles and procedures.

The Council's 2004-2006 Work Program was adopted by the Commission on April 29, 2004. In addition they completed their second year of collection of condition data on the federal-aid eligible system, published second Annual Report and submitted it to the Michigan Legislature and State Transportation Commission, developed a process for conducting pilot studies and issued a call for projects for such studies (16 of these pilot projects were consistent with work program activities, review of applications is in process).

Several major presentations on Asset Management were given throughout the year to the FHWA Delegation to Latvia, AASHTO/TRB Peer Exchange, and AASHTO Standing Committee on Planning, Upper Peninsula City Managers Association, County Road Association Annual Conference, Michigan Municipal League Annual Conference, and the MAR/MTPA Annual Conference.

TAMC also sponsored a "vendor fair" to review the capabilities of various management systems, developed a brochure for distribution to local governments outlining the basic principles of asset management, sponsored the National Highway Institution Course on Asset Management, and conducted a daylong planning session with members of Metropolitan Planning Organizations and regional planning agencies.

Total expenditures for FY 2004 were \$1,008,758 (\$1,626,390 budgeted).

By the end of 2005 TAMC will have completed their third year of roadway data collection (last year of collecting data on the federal aid system, beginning of data collection on the non-federal aid system). The Council will also be involved in the development of training course for road agencies, the purchase of strategic models, pilot studies will be completed, and working on an internet-based reporting process.

Mr. Palombo asked for questions; none were forthcoming.

Director Jeff amplified comments made by Mr. Palombo. Director Jeff stressed that comments made in the Government Performance Project Results (see Director's Report above) was that one of the real strengths of the State of Michigan and the infrastructure management was the work of the Asset Management Council—the unique nature of it and the need for it among other states.

Local Bridge Advisory Board Appointments – John Polasek

Mr. Polasek gave a brief summary behind the development of the LBAB. House Bill 5319 established funding for a Bridge Advisory Board. “The local bridge advisory board is created and shall consist of 6 voting members appointed by the state transportation commission and 2 nonvoting members appointed by the state transportation department.” The 6 voting members appointed by CRAM and MML are: Ronald Young (Alcona), Robert Wellington (Tuscola), Wayne Harrall (Kent), Bill Cole (Grand Rapids), Bob Clegg (Port Huron), and Michael Mitchell (Jonesville). The 2 nonvoting member appointed by MDOT are: Mark Harrison (Bridge Program Manager, Design Division) and Robert Kelley (Bridge Management Engineer, C&T Division).

Mr. Polasek asked for questions; none were forthcoming.

Mr. Polasek asked for approval of the appointments.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion for the approval of the Local Bridge Advisory Board Appointments. Motion was made by Commissioner Garside and supported by Commissioner Awrey to approve the Appointments. The motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

VI. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chairman Wahby asked if anyone wanted to address the Commission.

Mr. Gary Nayeart from the Michigan Road Builders Association thanked the Commission and the department for their responsiveness and assistance during his employment with MRBA. With the merger between AUC and MRBA (forming MITA), Mr. Nayeart will be leaving his position as of January 31st.

Commissioner Awrey thanked Mr. Nayeart for his assistance to the Commission in keeping them informed on issues pertaining to transportation.

Mr. Mike Nystrom, VP of Government and Public Relations for MITA, stated that he is excited about the new endeavor, and looks forward to working with the Commission and the rest of MDOT.

Chairman Wahby asked if any member of the Commission had comments; none were forthcoming.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 10:27 a.m.

The next full meeting of the Michigan State Transportation Commission will be held in Lansing, Michigan, on February 24, 2005, commencing at the hour of 9:00 a.m.

Frank E. Kelley
Commission Advisor